

RESPONSE
SN 10/081,311
PAGE - 6 of 8 -

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are pending in the application.

Claims 1-6, 10-13 and 17-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given United States Patent No. 6,674,756 issued to Rao et al. on January 6, 2004 in view of United States Patent No. 6,738,828 issued to Keats et al. on May 18, 2004.

Claims 7-9 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious given Rao et al. in view of Keats et al. as applied to claims 1 and 10 above, and further in view of United States Patent No. 5,764,955 issued to Doolan on June 9, 1998.

These grounds of rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reason.

Claims 1, 10 and 17 explicitly recite intercepting an input command/transaction language intended for a router. Notwithstanding the Office Action's suggestion to the contrary, Rao et al. and Keats et al. do not disclose or suggest intercepting an input command/transaction message intended for a router.

Rather, the Rao et al. arrangement receives an incoming call at a router. Note that the router of Rao et al. passively receives an incoming call destined for the router at one of its ports. The router of Roe et al. does not intercept and divert a message destined for another component in the communication network. This can be seen from Rao et al., column 8, line 66 through column 9, line 11.

In addition, Keats et al. also does not teach or suggest intercepting an input command/transaction message. Rather, the Keats et al. arrangement passively receives a Transaction Language 1 (TL1) message at a router. Keats et al. teaches that a shelf controller is located within the router, and the address in the TL1 message is resolved at the router. Therefore, Keats et al. teaches that the TL1 message is received at a router, and the router does not intercept and divert the TL1 message (i.e., the TL1 message is forwarded to its intended address). This can be seen in figure 2C, column 6, lines 59-60. Furthermore, it is unnecessary for the router in Keats et al. to intercept any messages at all because Keats et al. is silent with respect to partitioning a router into a plurality of virtual routers. Thus, the router of Keats et al. merely receives and routes a message in a standard manner, and does not intercept a message having a destination different from the translation module.

RESPONSE
SN 10/081,311
PAGE - 7 of 8 -

Interception is not passively receiving a message. As explained in applicants' specification, at page 12, lines 20-23:

Once the input command message is sent to the router 130 at step 510, the method 500 proceeds to step 512, where the translator program 124 intercepts the input command message. In particular, the in_from_sw module 402 intercepts the input command message and sends it to the trans_to_OXC module 404.

Note that the input command message is destined for the router, but the in_from_switch module intercepts the message and transmits it to the trans_to_OXC module for translation before sending it to the router. As a result, a single router functions as a plurality of virtual routers and is transparent to the network manager because of this translation module.

Thus, claims 1, 10 and 17 are allowable.

Regarding claims 2-6, 11-13 and 18-20, they depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1, 10 and 17 and recite additional features thereof. As such, and at least for the same reasons set forth above with respect to applicants' independent claims 1, 10 and 17, applicants submit that these claims are also non-obvious and allowable under 35 U.S.C. §103.

Regarding claims 7-9 and 14-16, each of the grounds of rejection applies only to dependent claims, and each is predicated on the validity of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 given Rao et al. in view of Keats et al. Since the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 given Rao et al. in view of Keats et al. has been overcome, as described hereinabove, and there is no argument put forth by the Office Action that Doolan supplies that which is missing from Rao et al. in view of Keats et al. to render the independent claims obvious, these grounds of rejection cannot be maintained. Therefore, applicants' claims 7-9 and 14-16 are non-obvious and patentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a).

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the claims presently in this application are non-obvious under the provisions of provisions of 35 U.S.C. §103. Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issue are respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that there are any unresolved issues requiring adverse final action in any of the claims now pending in the application, it is requested that the Examiner

RESPONSE
SN 10/081,311
PAGE - 8 of 8 -

telephone Eamon J. Wall at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

2/9/06

EJ Wall

Eamon J. Wall
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 39,414

Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
Attorneys at Law
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702